

JULIE A. DUNNE, Bar No. 160544
LARA K. STRAUSS, Bar No. 222866
JOSHUA LEVINE, Bar No. 239563
LITTLER MENDELSON
A Professional Corporation
501 W. Broadway
Suite 900
San Diego, CA 92101.3577
Telephone: 619.232.0441

Attorneys for Defendant
NORDSTROM, INC.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

GINO MARAVENTANO; and
NEESHA KURJI

Plaintiffs,

v.

NORDSTROM, INC., a Washington
Corporation; and DOES 1 through 10,
inclusive,

Defendants.

GINA BALASANYAN, an individual,
and NUNE NALBANDIAN, an
individual, on behalf of themselves and
all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

NORDSTROM, INC., a Washington
Corporation; and DOES 1 through 10,
inclusive,

Defendants.

Master Case No. 10cv2671 JM (WMc)

**DEFENDANT NORDSTROM,
INC.'S NOTICE OF
POTENTIALLY RELATED CASE**

[S.D. Local Rule 40.1]

**[This filing relates to case number
11cv2609]**

1 TO PLAINTIFFS, THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD AND THE COURT:

2 Please take notice that Defendant Nordstrom, Inc. (“Nordstrom”) submits the
3 following Notice of Potentially Related Case pursuant to United States District Court,
4 Southern District of California Local Rule 40.1. For the reasons specified below,
5 Nordstrom does not believe that the matter disclosed is related, but submits this notice
6 out of an abundance of caution to ensure compliance with the local rules.

7 NOTICE OF POTENTIALLY RELATED CASE

8 The following Illinois case may be related to the Balasanyan and Maraventano
9 actions:

10 *Beverly Gulley and Dina Pappas v. Nordstrom, Inc.*, Circuit Court of Cook
11 County, Illinois County Department, Chancery Division, Case No. 2013-CH-17490
12 (the “*Gulley* action”). The *Gulley* action is a putative class action filed on July 24,
13 2013 by two former Nordstrom salespeople who worked at a Nordstrom store located
14 in Oak Brook, Illinois. The plaintiffs in the *Gulley* action allege two legal claims for:
15 (1) violation of the Illinois Wage Payment and Collection Act (“IWPCA”); and (2)
16 violation of the Illinois Minimum Wage Law (“IMWL”). With respect to their
17 IWPCA claim, the *Gulley* plaintiffs seek to represent all sales associates “who were
18 compensated, in part or in full, on a commission basis in Illinois at any time between
19 July 24, 2003 and the present who did not receive the full amount of wages earned and
20 owed to them for work they performed without pay during Non-Sale Time in excess
21 of [Nordstrom’s] Policy Time.” With respect to the IMWL claim, the *Gulley*
22 plaintiffs seek to represent all sales associates “who were compensated, in part or in
23 full, on a commission basis in Illinois at any time between July 24, 2010 and the
24 present who did not receive the full amount of overtime wages earned and owed to
25 them for work they performed in excess of forty (40) hours per week without pay.”

26 Nordstrom does not believe it is necessary or appropriate to assign the *Gulley*
27 case to this Court, including because: (1) there is no overlap between the classes at
28 issue in each case (*Gulley* involves a putative class of only Illinois sales associates and

1 this case involves a class of only California sales associates); and (2) there is no
2 overlap between the claims at issue in each case (this case involves only claims under
3 California law whereas the *Gulley* case involves only claims under Illinois law).

4 For these reasons, assignment to a single judge is unlikely to effect a savings of
5 judicial effort or other economies.

6 Dated: August 16, 2013

7 /s/Joshua D. Levine
8 JULIE A. DUNNE
9 LARA K. STRAUSS
10 JOSHUA LEVINE
LITTLER MENDELSON, P.C.
Attorneys for Defendant
NORDSTROM, INC.

11 Firmwide:122357574.7 058713.1031
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28